United Nations CAC/COSP/EG.1/2018/4

Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption

Distr.: General
12 June 2018

Original: English

Report of the seventh open-ended intergovernmental expert meeting to enhance international cooperation under the United Nations Convention against Corruption, held in Vienna on 8 June 2018

I. Introduction

1. In resolution 4/2, entitled "Convening of open-ended intergovernmental expert meetings to enhance international cooperation", adopted by the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption at its fourth session, held in Marrakech, Morocco, from 24 to 28 October 2011, the Conference decided to convene open-ended intergovernmental expert meetings on international cooperation to advise and assist it with respect to extradition and mutual legal assistance.

2. In its resolution 5/1, the Conference directed the open-ended intergovernmental meeting of experts on international cooperation to continue studying the issue of the identification and analysis of existing obstacles to law enforcement cooperation in the detection of corruption offences in the framework of the Convention and to draw up recommendations on how those obstacles may be overcome.

3. In its resolution 7/1, the Conference invited the open-ended intergovernmental expert meeting to propose future agenda items. It also decided that the expert meeting should continue its work by exchanging information on common reasons for refusals and delays in mutual legal assistance requests related to corruption offences under the Convention and on international cooperation in civil and administrative proceedings related to cases of corruption and possible measures to protect the confidentiality of the information provided in the context of assistance in criminal, civil and administrative measures.

II. Organization of the meeting

A. Opening of the meeting

4. The seventh open-ended intergovernmental expert meeting to enhance international cooperation under the United Nations Convention against Corruption was held in Vienna on 8 June 2018.

5. The seventh expert meeting was chaired by Ignacio Baylina Ruiz (Spain).

V.18-04024 (E) 210618 220618

Please recycle

B. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

6. On 8 June 2018, the seventh expert meeting adopted the following agenda:

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
3. Implementation of chapter IV of the United Nations Convention against Corruption: lessons learned, good practices and challenges.
4. Civil and administrative proceedings relating to corruption.
5. Tools and services of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to promote international cooperation.
6. Adoption of the report, including conclusions and recommendations.

C. Attendance

7. The following States parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption were represented at the meeting: Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eswatini, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

8. The European Union, a regional economic integration organization that is a party to the Convention, was represented at the meeting.

9. The World Bank, a specialized agency of the United Nations system, was represented by an observer.

10. The Basel Institute of Governance, an institute of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network, was represented by an observer.

11. The following intergovernmental organizations were represented by observers: Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, International Anti-Corruption Academy, International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL), International Organization for Migration and Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

12. The Sovereign Military Order of Malta, an entity maintaining a permanent observer office at Headquarters, was represented.

III. Implementation of chapter IV of the United Nations Convention against Corruption: lessons learned, good practices and challenges

13. In an effort to enhance the exchange of information and synergies between the open-ended intergovernmental expert meetings to enhance international cooperation under the United Nations Convention against Corruption and the Working Group on International Cooperation established by the Conference of the Parties to the United

Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, a representative of the Secretariat provided an overview of the salient outcomes of the deliberations at the ninth meeting of the Working Group on International Cooperation, which had been held in Vienna on 30 and 31 May 2018, back to back with the eleventh meeting of the Working Group of Government Experts on Technical Assistance.

14. The two above-mentioned working groups considered the agenda item entitled "Preparation of the questionnaire to review the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime", with the aim of furthering their ongoing discussion to explore all options regarding an appropriate and effective mechanism for the review of implementation of the Organized Crime Convention and the Protocols thereto. The working groups also considered good practices for effective training and legislative assistance to enhance the implementation of the Organized Crime Convention and engaged in a discussion of challenges faced in the course of extradition proceedings, including (a) consultations between the requested and the requesting State; (b) sharing of information regarding extradition proceedings; and (c) technical assistance at the regional and global levels to support central authorities. The working groups were also briefed about the release and online availability of the redeveloped version of the Mutual Legal Assistance Request Writer Tool. The tool was revised to include additional types and means of mutual legal assistance to serve as guidance for practitioners involved in the drafting of requests. The tool was made available as an open resource on the website of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) (see www.unodc.org/mla/en/index.html). In the ensuing discussion, several speakers welcomed the presentation and noted the benefits of information exchange and synergies in that context. One speaker encouraged the participation of anti-corruption experts in the Working Group on International Cooperation relating to the Organized Crime Convention due to the similar nature of the tools and cooperation mechanisms available under the respective instruments.

15. A representative of the Secretariat presented the most prevalent trends and findings in the implementation of chapter IV of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, based on an analysis of the completed reviews of the first cycle of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the Convention, as well as challenges in the implementation of chapter IV of the Convention. The representative provided an oral update on the ongoing work to develop a set of non-binding recommendations and conclusions based on lessons learned regarding the implementation of chapters III and IV of the Convention during the first review cycle. The relevant paper (CAC/COSP/2017/5), submitted to the Conference pursuant to Conference resolution 6/1, analysed the outcomes of the country reviews in terms of identified successes, good practices, challenges, observations and technical assistance needs, based on an analysis of over 5,000 recommendations and nearly 1,000 good practices identified in 149 completed country reviews of the first cycle, as well as written submissions received from States parties. It was noted that an updated version of the paper would be made available to the Implementation Review Group to inform further discussion. A fuller analysis of these issues, and the outcomes of the first review cycle in general, is included in the second edition of the study, *State of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption: Criminalization, Law Enforcement and International Cooperation*, published for the seventh session of the Conference.

16. In the ensuing discussion, speakers recalled that effective international cooperation was of paramount importance in the fight against corruption. Several speakers reported on legislative, administrative and other measures taken with the aim of achieving the shared goal of eliminating safe havens for corrupt officials and funds. Several speakers shared their national experiences in making and receiving requests for extradition and mutual legal assistance and described challenges and successes in concrete cases. Several delegates underscored the need to remove obstacles to international cooperation and emphasized the importance of flexibility, a proactive approach, effectiveness and the simplification of requirements with a view

to ensuring the timely and efficient provision of international cooperation, in line with paragraph 24 of article 46 of the Convention. Some delegations noted that the simplification of requirements should take into account due process considerations. The benefits of establishing and maintaining informal channels of communication among competent authorities, both prior and in parallel to the formal international cooperation procedures, were repeatedly emphasized as a means of achieving greater efficiency and effectiveness of international cooperation. Various regional and international networks, platforms and forums, as well as law enforcement channels and arrangements, were referred to in this regard, as were specific mechanisms for cooperation and communication among financial intelligence units, including through the Egmont Group of Financial Intelligence Units. The benefits of continued exchange of information and experiences in the context of practitioner networks and under the umbrella of the Convention were emphasized. Some speakers also urged States parties to update the information in the UNODC online directory of competent national authorities under the Convention, including on central authorities for mutual legal assistance, to allow for more direct contacts.

17. Several speakers underlined the importance of using the Convention as a legal basis for international cooperation and welcomed the Secretariat's analysis of statistical information in this regard. Some speakers noted that the data suggested that there was greater potential for effective international cooperation using the tools and mechanisms of the Convention and in this context referred to existing challenges to effective cooperation. Several speakers encouraged States parties, including those requiring a treaty basis, to continue efforts to use the Convention in practice, including for non-coercive measures, while other speakers noted the usefulness of other regional and multilateral agreements or arrangements.

18. Some speakers described the challenges in obtaining information on international cooperation requirements at the national level and the usefulness of guidance, templates and information to facilitate the making of effective international cooperation requests. Furthermore, some speakers urged the continued collection and analysis of information on common reasons for refusals of and delays in mutual legal assistance in corruption-related cases, in accordance with Conference resolution 7/1, in order to develop a road map to deal with these issues.

19. Several speakers referred to the value of the implementation reviews under chapter IV of the Convention in identifying challenges and good practices in international cooperation. The importance of technical assistance was also mentioned in this regard. Some speakers urged States parties to continue to share relevant information on good practices in international cooperation. In that regard, some speakers encouraged reviewed States to publish their full country review report. One speaker noted that States parties should continue to proactively exchange information on their good practices in international cooperation in fighting corruption and explore other valuable sources of information, including information publicly available from reports such as those prepared by the Financial Action Task Force.

20. One speaker emphasized the importance and benefits of international cooperation with respect to civil and administrative proceedings related to corruption, including for the purposes of asset recovery, and encouraged experts to further study that matter.

21. In respect of law enforcement cooperation, as foreseen under article 48 of the Convention, one speaker suggested the development of a template and procedure for information requests for the purposes of law enforcement cooperation. In the context of article 59 of the Convention, one speaker referred to the Global Forum on Asset Recovery as a valuable initiative to advance international cooperation in criminal matters in practice, as well as to develop bilateral and multilateral agreements and arrangements in accordance with Conference resolution 7/2.

22. A representative of the Secretariat provided an update on the implementation of the mandates contained in previous Conference resolutions and emanating from previous expert group meetings. He referred to a note verbale dated 9 February 2018,

sent with a view to collecting information on electronic tools and systems for processing and tracking requests for mutual legal assistance; common reasons, observed in the practice of relevant authorities, given for refusals and delays in responding to mutual legal assistance requests related to offences under the Convention and possible suggestions for how to avoid such refusals and delays; international cooperation in civil and administrative proceedings related to cases of corruption; suggestions on possible measures to protect the confidentiality of the information requested for the purposes of civil and administrative proceedings related to cases of corruption in the requesting country, where the relevant matter was addressed by criminal proceedings in the requested country; statistics and cases on the use of the Convention as a legal basis for mutual legal assistance by relevant authorities including, where appropriate and consistent with domestic legal systems, in relation to civil and administrative proceedings; information on practical challenges arising in the work of central authorities responsible for requests under the Convention; and information on States parties' approaches and practices to the handling of mutual legal assistance requests of a *de minimis* nature. The extent of the information provided varied: a few States provided comprehensive information, while some provided limited information. All responses received from States parties as of 15 March 2018 containing substantive information were summarized in the progress report (CAC/COSP/EG.1/2018/2). The Secretariat noted that additional information was required in order to draw comprehensive conclusions on the matters identified and that more information was expected to be available after the completion of the second cycle of the Implementation Review Mechanism. He informed the Group that the Secretariat would continue to analyse the information received from States parties and would make it available at future meetings.

23. In its resolution 7/1, the Conference had welcomed the recommendations of the sixth open-ended intergovernmental expert meeting to enhance international cooperation under the Convention. In those conclusions and recommendations, the expert meeting, inter alia, had recommended that States parties should continue their efforts with regard to bridging the gap between different legal systems, particularly in the area of criminal procedure and evidence standards, by using the Convention as a legal basis, and by concluding detailed bilateral treaties and arrangements on mutual legal assistance.

24. In the same resolution, the Conference had requested the Secretariat to continue, within existing resources, to collect statistics or other relevant information on the use of the Convention as a legal basis for mutual legal assistance and to make the information available to the Conference.

25. The sixth open-ended intergovernmental expert meeting to enhance international cooperation under the Convention, held in Vienna on 6 and 7 November 2017, had recommended that the Secretariat continue its work on the analysis of practical challenges arising in the work of central authorities responsible for requests under the United Nations Convention against Corruption with a view to strengthening their effectiveness and efficiency.

26. As recommended at the sixth expert meeting, the discussion under this agenda item was informed by a thematic panel on common challenges faced by countries when requesting and responding to requests for mutual legal assistance with regard to those who committed offences under the Convention, as well as good practices in this area. Experts from Kazakhstan and the United States, as well as the British Virgin Islands and Guernsey, shared their experiences.

27. The panellist from the United States presented best practices and lessons learned by the Office of International Affairs of the United States Department of Justice in the area of international cooperation in corruption related cases. She underlined the importance of partnerships with the competent authorities at both the national and international levels and highlighted the crucial role of police-to-police cooperation in investigating transnational corruption cases. The panellist explained that the Office of International Affairs could provide assistance on the basis of both bilateral and

multilateral treaties and in the absence thereof. Pursuant to articles 43 and 46 of the Convention, the Office of International Affairs provided broad assistance in criminal matters including in cases of non-conviction-based forfeiture. The panellist also noted that assistance in civil matters may be provided through a civil process administered by the Civil Division of the Department of Justice. She further elaborated on the different types of evidence that the Office of International Affairs could assist in gathering, including bank and business records and electronic evidence, in addition to locating, identifying, contacting and interviewing witnesses. With regard to seizing and recovering assets, the panellist explained that the crime and the evidence should first be identified (typically using police-to-police cooperation channels), in order to demonstrate (a) the link between the assets and the crime, and (b) the need to initiate law enforcement measures pertaining to seizing, freezing, confiscating and ultimately returning assets.

28. The panellist informed the meeting about the type of information that should be included in assistance requests to the United States and mentioned several cases where requests for assistance received were based on the Convention. The panellist recommended that when making inquiries to the Office of International Affairs on specific issues, contact be made through national central authorities, and she underscored that successful international cooperation was a shared responsibility between requesting and requested States.

29. The panellist representing the Financial Investigation Agency of the British Virgin Islands noted that international cooperation could pose challenges, especially given the number of legal entities registered in the British Virgin Islands. Sharing of information about those entities was a challenge because many of those entities only maintained a legal presence in the territory. He noted that two main agencies were responsible for international cooperation in the British Virgin Islands: the Attorney General's Chambers, which was the central authority; and the Financial Investigation Agency (the financial intelligence unit), which was established in 2004 and was a member of the Egmont Group. The panellist further explained that the Financial Investigation Agency had additional responsibility to execute mutual legal assistance requests. In addition to exchanging information on the basis of the Egmont Group's principles of information exchange, the Agency was able to exchange information on the basis of reciprocity and trust. The Agency dealt only with law enforcement agencies or other financial intelligence units and was able to provide information within 21 days, for intelligence purposes only. The information was not to be shared with third parties without the authorization of the Agency. The panellist concluded by recommending that informal consultations be conducted, or informal requests for information be sent, prior to the initiation of formal mutual legal assistance requests.

30. The panellist from Guernsey, representing the Attorney General's Chambers, informed the meeting that the Attorney General was the central authority of Guernsey for mutual legal assistance. He gave an overview of the economy of Guernsey, which was largely based on financial services. He further referred to Guernsey's participation in the Camden Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network (CARIN) and the work carried out in cooperation with the UNODC/World Bank Stolen Asset Recovery (StAR) Initiative, whereby the authorities in Guernsey provided and received assistance, thereby improving their knowledge and ability to cooperate at the international level. The panellist also noted that all the financial services had been regulated, which allowed Guernsey to provide high-standard, quality information upon request. He further emphasized the importance of the timely submission of requests and quality of the information provided for the purposes of international cooperation. Guernsey's permissive and broad mutual legal assistance regime allowed for the provision of timely and useful information to requesting parties. He explained that spontaneous sharing of relevant information through the Egmont Group was the norm and that the authorities in Guernsey were ready to further cooperate with interested countries based on information exchange. It was highlighted that in some cases requesting States were facing problems of a residual nature at the national level because of actions taken by previous Governments. Such problems prevented those

States from preparing effective requests, which subsequently had an impact on the ability of Guernsey to provide assistance. The panellist urged States to carefully consider making informal requests before proceeding with formal mutual legal assistance requests. He concluded that international cooperation had legal and practical complexities, which, however, could be overcome provided that the requesting and the requested jurisdictions understood them and were willing to solve them together.

31. The panellist from Kazakhstan presented his country's experience in obtaining mutual legal assistance in corruption matters. He explained that more than 10 billion United States dollars had been stolen from Kazakhstan over the past 10 years and that more than 1,500 fugitives had escaped from justice to more than 200 countries. The panellist informed the expert group meeting of the stolen asset recovery project undertaken by the Prosecutor General's Office, which included developing clear and short guidelines for investigators and prosecutors, including on the basis of templates prepared by the StAR Initiative, and synchronizing the efforts of the financial intelligence unit and law enforcement authorities. He further explained that the guidelines and templates were based on good international practices, inter alia, those developed by UNODC and the StAR Initiative, and had been adapted to local conditions and requirements of the legal system of Kazakhstan. He also noted that Kazakhstan had joined CARIN and the Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network for Asia and the Pacific (ARIN-AP) with the assistance of the StAR Initiative. Regarding the search and seizure of ill-gotten proceeds abroad, the panellist emphasized the use of four essential tools, which were deployed depending on the type of assistance or information sought: the Egmont Group channel, the inter-agency network channels such as CARIN and INTERPOL, open-source intelligence, and mutual legal assistance channel. The panellist concluded by presenting a case study involving a former manager of a national bank accused of embezzling over 7.5 billion United States dollars. He highlighted the challenges faced in that case, including the use of shell companies to launder the funds and the difficulty of linking the stolen assets to the predicate offence. The panellist noted that the case also involved the submission of more than 400 assistance requests and a civil claim initiated abroad by the bank as a victim in order to claim damages in excess of 4 billion United States dollars, as a result of which more than 1 billion dollars' worth of assets had been recovered in different jurisdictions.

32. In the ensuing discussion, speakers welcomed the panel presentations and the opportunity to exchange practical information on common challenges faced by countries when requesting and responding to requests for mutual legal assistance. One speaker shared his country's experience in supporting transnational corruption investigations and prosecutions, regardless of where the case was ultimately disposed of, with a view to supporting the resolution of such cases through international cooperation. In response to a question posed to a panellist in regards to worldwide confiscation orders, the significance of such orders as a tool for effective international cooperation was emphasized. Speakers also highlighted the benefits of value-based confiscation, as foreseen under paragraph 1 (a) and paragraph 2 of article 31 of the Convention. One speaker referred to the forthcoming European Union directive on countering money-laundering by criminal law, which would bring more instruments to improve the fight against money-laundering and terrorist financing across the European Union, including measures related to non-conviction-based confiscation.

IV. Civil and administrative proceedings relating to corruption

33. A representative of the Secretariat presented a summary of the information collected pursuant to Conference resolutions 6/4 and 7/1 on practical issues encountered by States parties when requesting and providing assistance in investigations of and proceedings in civil and administrative matters related to cases of corruption, and possible measures to protect the confidentiality of the information provided in the context of assistance in criminal, civil and administrative measures.

34. In response to a note verbale sent by the Secretariat, most of the States had reported that they had limited or no experience in international cooperation in civil and administrative proceedings related to cases of corruption. Some States reported that they could provide assistance only with regard to criminal measures, while some noted that there were no obstacles in their legal system to providing such assistance.

35. Suggestions made by States regarding enhancing measures to protect the confidentiality of the information had included making confidentiality an explicit requirement when submitting the request, better coordination and consultation between the parties, and the development of procedural guidance on this subject.

36. In the ensuing discussion, some speakers reported specific measures that their countries had taken in order to effectively apply anti-corruption civil and administrative mechanisms in line with the Convention. One speaker expressed her country's support for the work of the Secretariat and that of the expert meeting in exploring cooperation in civil and administrative proceedings relating to corruption. She noted that in recent complex corruption cases involving foreign jurisdictions, her country continued to face serious obstacles to cooperation in the context of non-criminal proceedings, and emphasized the need for improvements and further efforts in that field. Noting the limited number of responses to this agenda item, another speaker suggested postponing further consideration of this issue until there were sufficient data to reach conclusions.

V. Tools and services of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to promote international cooperation: an update

37. A representative of the secretariat, recalling chapter IV (International cooperation) of the United Nations Convention against Corruption and the requirements of the terms of reference of the review mechanism, introduced the technical assistance and other activities relevant to international cooperation under the Convention. He indicated that UNODC continued to provide capacity-building services to States parties. UNODC also participated in meetings and conferences aimed at coordinating international cooperation, including the meetings of the Group of 20 Anti-Corruption Working Group at which a research paper on practical trends and challenges in international cooperation in corruption matters based on the outcome of the first review cycle had been presented. UNODC also organized a regional workshop on international cooperation in financial investigations, anti-money-laundering and recovery of assets, focusing on the recommendations stemming from the first cycle of the Implementation Review Mechanism, for law enforcement agencies, prosecutors and financial intelligence units from six countries in South Asia, and participated in the regional conference on the prevention and fight against terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and its financing in Latin America and the Caribbean. The representative also highlighted the launch of the online version of the UNODC Mutual Legal Assistance Request Writer Tool.

38. Another representative of the Secretariat gave an update on the online directory of competent national authorities under the United Nations Convention against Corruption. She introduced the five different types of authorities whose information was collected by the secretariat pursuant to articles 6 and 46 of the Convention and following the recommendations of the Conference of the States Parties and the expert meeting to enhance international cooperation under the Convention.

39. The representative of the Secretariat indicated that as of 30 May 2018, 113 States parties had provided information about their prevention authorities, pursuant to article 6, paragraph 3, of the Convention; 129 States parties had provided information regarding their central authorities for mutual legal assistance in accordance with article 46, paragraph 13, of the Convention; 80 States parties had shared information with regard to their asset recovery focal points, in accordance with Conference resolution 4/4; 23 States parties had designated their central authorities

for extradition, pursuant to the recommendation made at the fifth expert meeting; and 30 States parties had provided information about their focal points on the use of civil and administrative proceedings relating to corruption, in accordance with Conference resolution 6/4 and the recommendation made at the fifth expert meeting. The representative explained the procedure of submitting updates to the directory and encouraged States parties to continue providing information on their competent national authorities, with a view to strengthening the directory's usefulness in facilitating effective international cooperation.

40. Several speakers welcomed the development by the Secretariat of online tools, including the mutual legal assistance request writer tool, the *Manual on International Cooperation for the Purposes of Confiscation of Proceeds of Crime*, which addressed value-based confiscation, and the online directory of competent national authorities, and requested the Secretariat to continue to update the information held in that directory. Some speakers urged all States parties to submit the pertinent information to the directory. One speaker underlined his country's financial support for the maintenance of the online tools provided by the Secretariat, while another speaker suggested that the Secretariat facilitate access for practitioners to the tools available on the UNODC website. In that regard, one speaker recommended that UNODC continue to enhance its website containing all tools and resources pertaining to international cooperation, especially those for mutual legal assistance, and proposed to include a link to the above-mentioned *Manual on International Cooperation for the Purposes of Confiscation of Proceeds of Crime*.

VI. Conclusions and recommendations

41. The seventh expert meeting reiterated the importance of States parties providing to each other the greatest possible extent of assistance in the investigation and prosecution of corruption offences and enhancing the efficiency of international cooperation by endeavouring to simplify relevant procedures, in accordance with domestic law.

42. The seventh expert meeting reaffirmed the recommendations made at the third, fourth, fifth and sixth expert meetings (see CAC/COSP/EG.1/2014/3, CAC/COSP/EG.1/2015/3, CAC/COSP/EG.1/2016/2 and CAC/COSP/EG.1/2017/3).

43. Furthermore, the seventh expert meeting agreed on the following recommendations:

(a) States parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption should continue their efforts with regard to proactively cooperating in matters related to extradition, mutual legal assistance and law enforcement cooperation using the Convention as a legal basis and giving relevant requests priority, subject to the requirements of their domestic legal systems;

(b) States parties are encouraged to continue to provide to the Secretariat information on challenges and good practices in international cooperation and other topics outlined in the Conference's resolutions and the recommendations of the expert meetings, with a view to the Secretariat continuing its analytical work with regard to challenges in international cooperation based on the Convention;

(c) States parties are encouraged to regularly update the information contained in the directory of competent national authorities;

(d) States parties that have not yet done so should consider supplying information for inclusion in the directory of competent national authorities;

(e) States parties should continue to promote formal and informal channels of cooperation and to establish efficient and effective communication channels, including where feasible, by exchanging liaison officers and participating in practitioners' networks;

(f) States parties are encouraged to consider, where appropriate and consistent with their legal systems, more actively cooperating in civil and administrative measures in the context of transnational cooperation in corruption cases;

(g) States parties should actively support the provision of technical assistance in the area of international cooperation and should facilitate the organization of training courses and expert meetings to that effect, with a view to creating further platforms for information and knowledge exchange;

(h) States parties are encouraged to consider publishing or making publicly available the final verdicts in cases involving corruption;

(i) States parties are encouraged to continue to actively participate, including through relevant competent authorities, anti-corruption bodies and practitioners involved in mutual legal assistance and extradition, in future expert meetings to enhance international cooperation under the United Nations Convention against Corruption and in meetings of other working groups organized under the auspices of the Conference of the States Parties;

(j) The Secretariat should continue its analytical work by seeking information from States parties, in particular in relation to the reasons for refusal of mutual legal assistance requests based on the Convention and related procedural timelines, in order to develop a road map to address related issues in the future;

(k) The Secretariat should continue its efforts to ensure synergies between the work of the open-ended intergovernmental expert meetings to enhance international cooperation under the United Nations Convention against Corruption and the work of the Working Group on International Cooperation established by the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

VII. Adoption of the report

44. On 8 June 2018, the seventh expert meeting adopted its report (CAC/COSP/EG.1/2018/L.1 and the parts of the draft report on items 3, 4 and 5, as well as the conclusions and recommendations of the meeting).